Regr. No. 77 Register of the Rokka juttagai village of Saidvalli Kargadicheri (No.) in the Palavelam Maganam Negapatam Taluk Tanjore district

Nagapatam Taluk

1 Rel. Lands Entire
Ditto 50-21-8¼ 50·54
Deduct Poramboke 14-36-5¾ 14·91
Remg. Wet 9-21-½ 9·53 75-6-0
Dry (20-38-12 20·97) 49-4-2
Topu (4-17-12 4·64) 10-7-0
Garden 0-27-9 ·69 3-12-6
35-25-3 35·63 138-12-5 ......
35·41 88

Completed

For the expenses of Faz Frok Fakir's Takkiya in the village of Tiruvarur. The Takkiya is said to be in good condition and the usual services are performed.

Jodi 35-12-5
Kovil 4-9-1

not known not known No documents Faz Frok Fakir's Takkiya

Fs. F1210. Sandwal Rokka gutti Kargadicheri entire Rokka juttagai village
W 1-10-0
D 1-0-0
Por 1-0-0
2-10-0

Fs. F1226. Rokka juttagai village of Saidvalli Kargadicheri
W 1-12-44
D 3-0-63
Por 0-19-90¼
5-12-97¾
former Ditto
W 1-17-61 3/16
D 3-1-16½
G 0-1-83 7/16
Topu 0-18-64 7/8
Por 1-3-79 1/8
6-18-5 1/8
no permnt.

Fs. F1238. Rokka juttagai village Saidvalli Kargadicheri
50-21-8¾

Faz Frok Fakir's Takkiya at Tiruvarur
Manager
Nidarho Fakir

This is an entire Rokka juttagai village. The grant for it is not available, nor is it entered in the Regr. of 1809. The Inam appears however as an entire village in the Karnam Jumla acct. of F1210. It is held for the benefit of a Takkiya in Tiruvarur which holds other Inams also. The entry in the acct. just mentioned, merely shows that the village is a Rokka juttagai Inam and does not specify to whom it belongs. The extent entd. in it is much less than the former extent given in the acct. of F1226, but as Inams were then more observed elsewhere, it was not the result of any enhancement. The survey of the lands in that Fasli (1226) showed an excess of nearly 25 p% over the previous accounted ditto whilst the result of the measurement which took place in F1238, is larger than that again by 10 p%. The Inam is entd. in the acct. of F1226 in the name of Pira Shah, the then manager of the Takkiya, & in whose name the other Inams also appear in the accounts of the villages in which they are situated. The whole village being Inam, & no complaint appearing ever to have been preferred of encroachment on the surrounding Sarkar lands, the excess is not chargeable.

The rates of assessment adopted are the averages of those obtaining on the Ayan lands in the 3 adjoining Sarkar villages & they are Rs 48-5-5, 36-2-8 & 15-8-0 per Veli respectively of Wet, Garden & Dry.

To be confirmed and continued for the benefit of the Takkiya.

28-11-64. Rajagopala Charlu
D.C.

Confirmed on present tenure.
2/2/65

T.D. No. 1867

6

F.D.

Sheet No 142

Regr. No. 78 Register of the Sarvamanyam village of Tetti in the Kilvelur Maganam Negapatam Taluk Tanjore district.

1 Rel. Lands Wet
103 1-16-11½
104 1-8-7½
105 1-11-12½
106 1-32-13¾
107 2-6-6¾
551 0-17-13
99 0-10-½
311 0-27-13¾
9-12-1¼ 9·30 41-2-10
Dry
550 1-16-3
552 0-35-0
554 0-11-11
560 0-22-8
563 0-9-6
251 0-20-11½
553 0-14-6
555 0-8-0
556 0-6-0
4-24-2 4·60 3-14-6
13-36-1½ 13·90 45-1-2 ....

At the average Wet & Dry rates adopted for the village.

For the expenses of Sri Agniswaraswami Pagoda in the village. The Pagoda is said to be in good condition and the worship is performed.

Kovil 3-12-3

not known not known No documents Sri Agniswaraswami .....

Have entered this case as [illegible] among the others of the kind, as a separate case.

Of the V4-19-98 5/8 entered in the name of this Swami in F1226 only V2-2-5¼ are now in enjoyment. Regarding the rest vide remarks in Case No. 2.

To be confirmed and continued for the benefit of the Pagoda.

9-12-64. Rajagopala Charlu
D.C.

Fs. F1226. Tetti by Sarvamanyam swami Pagoda Inam
1-10-3½
former Ditto
4-19-98 5/8
no permnt.

Fs. F1229. Tetti by Sarvamanyam swami's Inam
13-36-1¼

Sri Agniswaraswami at Tetti
Worshipper
Subayambhugurukkal

The village in which this Inam is situated is an entire Sarvamanyam village. As I have more than once observed elsewhere that Inams of this description are to be met with in almost every village in this District Inam as well as Sarkar — that they appear to have been originally granted by the Mirasidars of the village to Pagodas &c. out of their Porambokes — that they are entered & recognized in the District accts. as distinct from the regular Sarvamanyams — that as such it was not usual to make any mention of them in the Sethas for the villages — where the absence of such allusion to them does not argue their non existence at the time. Moreover, these Inams are supported by entries in the acct. of F1225 which give also their former extents. The holders of the village cannot [illegible] set up their claim [illegible] in them.

Cfd.
2/2/65

F.D.

T.D. No. 1868.

[illegible]
[illegible] 521-28-3½ 521·71
[illegible] 203-27-1½ 203·70

[illegible] Wet 209-31-3 209·78
Dry 104-24-15½ 104·85
Garden 3-14-2½ 3·35

318-–-5 318·08

Deduct Inams
Wet 9-12-½ 9·30
Dry 4-24-½ 4·60

13-36-1½ 13·90

Remg. Wet 200-19-2½ 200·48 | 887-8-5
Dry 100-10-15½ 100·25 | 85-2-1
Garden 3-14-2½ 3·35 | 5-12-10

306-4-3½ 304·11 | 979-7-4

[illegible] garden [illegible] namely [illegible] [illegible] land.

No.	Wet	Dry	Garden	Total	Asst.	Kaval
1.	192-36-–	100-10-15½	3-14-2½	296-21-1½	945-14-5	52-6-5
2.	5-19-7½	–	–	5-19-7½	24-4-8	–
3.	1-15-13½	–	–	1-15-13½	6-2-11	–
4.	–-27-13½	–	–	–-27-13½	3-1-4	–-4-–
	200-19-2½	100-10-15½	3-14-2½	304-4-3½	979-7-4	52-10-5

For the ex-Kaval [illegible] pences of 52-11-5 [illegible] Hazarath Khadarvali Ganja Baksh Ganjasavayi Darga at Nagore. The building is said to be in good condition and the usual services are rendered.

Granted Sitta [illegible] in 1809 and [illegible] directing that the village of Tetti with 13 others be [illegible] by the Darga of [illegible] [illegible] Khader Alli Ganj Baksh Ganj Savaiji at Nagore. [illegible] Saheb on the 2d Rabila [illegible] of [illegible] Saltan Mogul Hijira 1171.

Hazarath Khadarvali Ganja Baksh Ganjasavayi Dargah

In the Regr. of 1809 Darga of Nagore Tetti [illegible] village
W 20-6-33¼
D 40-1-52½
60-7-86½
as Regr.

In F1226 Nagore [illegible] Tetti
W 21-19-78½
D 2-17-4
G 35-11-4
60-7-86¼
[illegible]

W 22-12-64½
D 4-9-33⅝
G 4-3-26¼
Pr 38-17-18⅝
66-2-82¾
as [illegible]

In F1210 Nagore [illegible]
W 17-2-–
D 2-14-–
Pr 5-6-–
25-2-–

In F1238 [illegible] village of Tetti
1 Sathanaiyakan
W 5-19-7¼
2 [illegible] Mangan
W 1-15-13¼
3 [illegible] Saran
W 27-13¼
4 [illegible] Saheb
3-15-15¼
5 [illegible] [illegible] enjoying [illegible]
40-36-6¼
6 [illegible] Darga
455-18-14
507-52-2½

1. Hazarath Khadarvali Ganja Baksh Ganjasavayi dargah at Nagore

Trustees
Khalifa Said Pir Mohammad Sahib &c

2. Sri Sabhanayakar at Tetti
Worshipper
Swayambhugurukkal

3. Mutthu Vinayakar at Kottagam
Worshipper
Tyagaraja gurukkal

4. Mariyamman at Tetti
Worshipper
Kattan

This is an entire Sarvamanyam village supported by a grant. A number of other villages was granted along with this in one and the same Sitta to the Durgah at Nagore. The extent of none of these villages is specified in the grant. The accts. of F1210 however give the area & these are in some cases quoted in the Register of 1809, which describes also the extent as [illegible] [illegible]. The length of the [illegible] is not specified in other accounts. The extents entered in the acct. of F1210 do not appear to be the results of any measurement. They differ considerably in [illegible] cases from the extents [illegible] in the Regr. of 1809 & the acct. of F1226. In this case the differences between what is entered in these accts. & the extents in the other two are respectively 35¼ & 41 Velis or 140 & 165 [illegible]. The measurements of F1238 again have shown an excess of about 21 [illegible] over the extent in F1226. If these recent [illegible] are assumed to have been correctly made & the excess is ascribed to encroachments, then it will follow that the difference between the extents in the accts. of [illegible] [illegible] measurements [illegible] have been acquired by encroachment made [illegible] surrounding lands in the intermediate period. This is not at all likely, the entire village having been granted in Inam, the excess in it, which is not alleged to have resulted from encroachments, whatever it may be is not chargeable.

In the acct. of F1226 [illegible] [illegible] pieces of ground, amounting together to V 4-14-45⅝ are entered as Inam in the name of [illegible] [illegible] Pagoda in the village. Of these 5 [illegible] only 3, whose extents entered in [illegible]

[illegible] V 1-9-76½, but found by the measurement of F1238 to be 13-36-1¼, are entered in the acct. of [illegible] [illegible] in the [illegible] name. The other two were [illegible], one whose extent in F1226 was V 3-3-–, in the name of [illegible] [illegible], & the other, V [illegible]-5-22⅛ in extent, in that of [illegible]. The parties now enjoying these [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], like the [illegible] for the [illegible] [illegible] in the village, to the Darga. The present holders of them [illegible] [illegible] them it appears from one Sabhanayaga Pillai & Velayudha Pillai who [illegible] appear to have been long enjoying these lands, the entry of them in the name of the [illegible] being only nominal. However, as the former extent of the [illegible] Inam is given in the accts. of F1226 as only V 1-15-3½, it is [illegible] that these lands, belonging perhaps as alleged to the individuals [illegible], are then [illegible] in the [illegible] names. These lands paying [illegible] said to be [illegible] to the Darga, like the other lands in the village, have become in fact Darga lands. I have therefore included them, as has been done in the [illegible], in the Darga's Inam.

Stands Nos. 2-3 [illegible] enjoyed appear in these names in the [illegible]. They are [illegible] [illegible] found in the accts. of F1226, & when or by whom they were granted is not known. The parties concerned allege that they have been in enjt. from before F1226. The holders of the village admit that they are enjd. rent free by the Pagodas in question & do not claim any interest in them.

The rates of assessment adopted are the average of those obtaining on the [illegible] lands in the 3 adjoining [illegible] villages, & they are Rs 29-4-3, 14-2-8 & 5-9-10 per Veli respectively for Wet, garden & Dry.

To be confirmed in 4 T.Ds. The extent in No. 1 [illegible] enjoyment [illegible] rent free – whereas the others [illegible] to be charged ¼ Q.R., which is for No. 2 Rs 6 [illegible] for No. 3 Rs 1-8-– & for No. 4 Rs –-12-–

[illegible] Rajagopala Charlu
[illegible]

The whole village confirmed as present tenure to No 1 in Col 16 without disturbing the possession of Nos 2 to 4.
2/2/66 [illegible]

7

306
T.D. No 866

[illegible]